MINUTES

PRESENT:
Andersen, Libby         Articulation Officer—City College
Armstrong, Elizabeth    Vice President, Instruction—Mesa College
Gustin, Paula           Curriculum Chair—Mesa College
Hess, Shelly            Dean, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Ingle, Henry T.         Vice Chancellor, Instructional Services, Planning & Technology—
                        District Office
Manzoni, Ron            Vice President, Instruction—City College
Murphy, Carol           Curriculum Chair—Miramar College
Parker, Juliette        Articulation Officer—Mesa College
Short, Duane            Academic Senate Representative, Articulation Officer—Miramar
                        College
Vincent, Bill           Vice President, Instruction—Miramar College
Weaver, Roma            Curriculum Chair—Continuing Education

ABSENT:
Lombardi, Jan           Curriculum Chair—City College
Matthew, Esther         Representative, Academic Senate—Continuing Education
Neault, Lynn            Vice Chancellor, Student Services—District Office (Ex Officio)

STAFF:
VanHouten, Laurie       Curriculum Analyst, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
Nasca, Shannon          Senior Secretary, Curriculum & Instructional Services—District Office
I. MINUTES AND AGENDA

A. Approval of: September 13, 2007 Minutes

The minutes were approved. M/S/P (Andersen/Parker)
9 for, 0 against, 1 abstained

B. Approval of: October 11, 2007 Agenda

Added to the Agenda:
Humanities 106, World Religions
Personal Growth 065, Orientation to College

The agenda was approved as amended. M/S/P (Andersen/Manzoni)

II. CURRICULUM REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. Approval of Curriculum

The curriculum was approved by consent. M/S/P (Short/Manzoni)

B. Approval of Program Changes

None.

C. Approval of Continuing Education Curriculum

None.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Title 5 Changes Subcommittee

Shelly Hess informed the Council that at the last CIC meeting it was discussed that a subcommittee be formed to address the Title 5 changes. The Title 5 changes to be discussed are Certificates of Completion and Transfer Studies Degree. Hess stated the Council needed to determine which members would be on the subcommittee. Duane Short asked if Hess was asking for volunteers for the committee and she responded yes. Duane Short, Ron Manzoni and Libby Andersen all volunteered to be on the subcommittee. Henry Ingle stated there needs to be one faculty member from each college on the subcommittee. Liz Armstrong volunteered Paula Gustin to be on the subcommittee to represent Mesa College. Hess volunteered to provide administrative support as well.

IV. NEW BUSINESS

A. Course Activation Process

Hess gave the Council the history behind the course activation process. In 1998, there was a discussion at CIC to require concurrence for approval of course
activation proposals. However, there was no change to procedure. In 2004, another discussion arose regarding the process for approving course activations and a change to procedure was adopted. The changes to procedure allowed colleges to process course activations without concurrence of other colleges in the District, but the course activations would be reviewed at the CIC meetings. She stated the discussion is now focused on the impact on enrollment due to the activation of courses. The point in the process in which the other colleges review those courses is currently at the CIC level rather than earlier in the approval process.

The issue now is the other colleges have indicated they would like to review courses earlier in the process. Hess explained that the Council will develop a taskforce to review the process and possibly implement changes.

Liz Armstrong and Carol Murphy volunteered to be on the taskforce to review the course activation process. Hess asked if a member of the Council from City College wanted to volunteer for the taskforce. Manzoni declined, stating that City College trusted Armstrong and Murphy. Hess offered to serve as administrative support.

B. Walked-In Curriculum

Hess invited Murphy to present Miramar College’s walked-in curriculum to the Council.

*Personal Growth 065, Orientation to College*

Murphy explained that Personal Growth (PERG) 065 is a course activation. She mentioned the Counseling department would like to work with the high school students in this orientation course. Miramar would like the course to be activated as soon as possible so they can work with the high school students in the Spring 2008 semester. Van Houten asked if the effective term could be changed from Fall 2007 to Spring 2008. Murphy explained the hope is to run the course with a small group of high school students from the District’s feeder high schools this semester.

Andersen stated the transfer degree applicability for the course is basic skills ESL, but it is also associate degree credit only, not transferable. She stated the course should be numbered below 100 and Murphy agreed. Andersen continued that the Council could not make the change and Murphy agreed. Van Houten stated that the change may have been made, but was not updated in CurricUNET. Manzoni pointed out that the T.O.P. Code on the outline was 4930 and it is not correct. Van Houten agreed that if the course was supposed to be basic skills then the course number is not appropriate. The course should not be associate degree applicable.

Armstrong was fine with the course being approved for activation at Miramar. However, she would like for Mesa to be given the chance to review the course to determine whether it should be associate degree credit or basic skills.
Ingle explained that the Miramar program with some of the feeder schools is an online pilot program with about 16 students. He stated that the District is working to extend the agreement so City and Mesa Colleges can participate with the feeder schools as well. Ingle informed the Council that Chancellor Carroll was asked for a District-wide agreement with the feeder schools.

Van Houten asked if the course was supposed to be Distance Education and if it was online. Murphy answered that the course was supposed to be offered in a face-to-face environment to prepare the students for distance education. Ingle interjected that distance education would not be fully online; it is a hybrid course, where the students meet face-to-face in the lab. Van Houten asked if the course was on the Miramar College campus and Ingle explained that the course would be at the high school. Van Houten added if any of the instruction is delivered at a distance the course has to be approved for distance education, which is a new Title 5 change. Ingle indicated the instruction had already been approved for distance education. Murphy and Van Houten stated that distance education had not been approved for the course for Miramar College.

Shorts’ understanding from the originator is that he is not planning on teaching the course through distance education. He explained that the course itself helps students understand how to take distance education courses.

Armstrong informed the Council that PERG 065 at Mesa College is an orientation to college, not an orientation to taking distance education courses, therefore she is wondering if this is the correct course. Bill Vincent explained that his understanding of the course is that it is an orientation course.

Armstrong stated on the curriculum report it is written under “Course Analysis Data, G., Extraordinary Cost: Access to the internet and WebCT for the online content” shows the course is intended to be taught online. Murphy did not think there was access to make changes. Since Mesa College is the originating college, Miramar cannot change the curriculum report that Mesa College implemented. Short stated the textbooks can be changed.

Short summed up that the Council is looking at two issues with this course, (1) whether it is okay for the course to be taught at Miramar and (2) whether the course is basic skills or associate degree credit and whether it is an online course. Short asked if it is possible to approve the course at this CIC meeting for Miramar to teach it.

*The Personal Growth 065, Orientation to College was approved for activation at Miramar College pending review of the course for clarification of basic skills or associate degree status.*

M/S/P (Armstrong/Gustin)

[Armstrong confirmed at the November 11, 2007, CIC meeting that the Personal Growth 065 course is associate degree applicable.]

Armstrong requested when courses are walked-in to the CIC meetings that copies of the course outlines are brought along with the curriculum report.
Humanities 106, World Religions
Murphy explained the faculty member activating the course would like to activate it for the Spring 2008 semester. The proposal was completed in the summer semester, but was delayed because of an email notification problem in CurricUNET. Murphy stated that Short had more information regarding the course. Short explained that the course is preparation for the major for several majors at public and private universities, and is likely to be approved for general education purposes. The reason it is urgent for Miramar to walk the course in to CIC now is because it needs to be sent to the UC system for approval for UC transfer credit by Monday October 15, 2007.

Juliette Parker questioned whether the course was to be offered in the spring 2008 semester and Short confirmed that it was. Short explained that it would be retroactively approved. Parker said this process is not what had been discussed. She explained that there is a policy in place stating the course must have approval before it is offered. Short answered that the policy at Miramar is courses that have already been approved for IGETC or CSU GE at other colleges are being activated and have been offered in the earliest term possible retroactively because it is assumed the course will be approved.

Armstrong asked if consultation has occurred between the three colleges’ faculty regarding enrollment concerns. Armstrong also asked if the course is to be submitted for articulation and how old is the course outline, because it needs to be updated. Murphy answered that Miramar had discussed other courses with the other two colleges, making sure that they have spoken to the particular departments and checked on enrollment issues. However, since this course was presented to her in spring of last year, before there was such concern regarding enrollment issues she did not have a discussion with the other colleges. Murphy agreed that if there is not sufficient enrollment in the course at the other two colleges then Miramar does not want to infringe on it.

Manzoni did not agree with the process of approving courses with the hope the course will be approved for IGETC and CSU GE. He recommended the courses need to be approved, then entered into the catalog and then offered.

Andersen explained City College has had two Chicano Studies courses that are active at Mesa, denied UC transferability because the outlines were outdated. Short confessed that he had not had a chance to look at the outline for Humanities 106. Murphy stated that the date the outline was written was in 1999. Andersen explained that the course met the standard at the time, but that was in 1996.

Hess asked the Council if there was further discussion regarding Humanities 106 or if the Council would like to approve or table the course. Murphy withdrew the course until further research is complete.
V. STANDING REPORTS

A. Curriculum Updating Project
Van Houten stated that the handout reflected the current course integration tallies. Armstrong asked Van Houten if the numbers included the courses up for 6-year review. Van Houten answered the list did not include those courses. Van Houten volunteered to email the list of courses to be integrated to the Council.

Andersen requested that course integrations be added to the next CIC agenda for discussion.

B. CurricUNET Steering Committee
Van Houten informed the Council that the Steering Committee would be meeting on October 18, 2007 and would be discussing the process to separate special topics courses from experimental courses and that Duane Short will be attending the meeting to clarify his recommendations to changing District Procedure. Van Houten continued that she would bring the recommendations to the CIC for approval.

Van Houten informed the Council that she would be talking with Jason from Governet to review some additional items to finalize the data entry changes for programs in CurricUNET. Gustin added that as part of the change the committee is going to separate out the programs. She asked Van Houten if it is possible for Mesa College to separate the programs in the catalog before the CurricUNET changes are implemented. Van Houten explained that Mesa College would need to contact Jeff Mills at the District Instructional Services Office and organize a meeting with him. She stated that Mills would have to coordinate the changes that Mesa wants in the catalog draft.

Weaver informed the Council that the Continuing Education CurricUNET Steering Committee finalized everything. She stated that thanks to Short and his input on approvals, CE is more closely following the process the colleges use. Weaver stated Van Houten helped her finalize a testing plan which included deleting a lot of things the colleges tested that CE does not need to. On October 31, 2007, the test web-site will be up and ready for testing during the months of November and December. If everything is tested during those months, CE CurricUNET will go live on February 5, 2008. Weaver explained CE is hoping the CurricUNET process will help them with articulation to the colleges. CE currently has five articulation agreements in place.

C. Student Services Council
No report.

D. State Academic Senate
No report.

E. Chief Instructional Officers
No report.
F. Articulation Officers

Short informed the Council that on Monday October 15, 2007, the Southern California Intersegmental Articulation Council (SCIAC) Fall Conference was being held in Long Beach, CA.

Gustin stated that she is receiving pressure from the Academic Senate to discuss assigning courses into multiple disciplines. For example, a speech course may fall under speech or psychology. There are several colleges in the state that cross-list courses. Gustin recalled bringing this topic to the Council last year.

Gustin wanted to open the discussion again because Parker brought to her attention that Southwestern College does assign courses to multiple disciplines. Gustin asked Hess how Southwestern integrated the process. Hess agreed to show the college how Southwestern integrated multiple disciplines if this is the direction the colleges choose. Hess asked Gustin if the discussion should be placed on the next CIC agenda. Gustin answered that she is not sure where Mesa’s Academic Senate was in regards to the other two colleges. She continued the Mesa College Academic Senate passed a resolution last year that this project was to begin. She is not willing to do the project unless City and Miramar agree.

Gustin explained the State Academic Senate suggested assigning courses into multiple disciplines several years ago. Initially, she was not clear why the State Academic Senate wanted to cross-list courses. Short stated that Miramar has one course that is cross-listed. Andersen stated that City College has Drama and Radio/TV courses that are cross-listed.

Hess explained at Southwestern College both course outlines were in CurricUNET. For example, Sociology and Psychology in CurricUNET would be Sociology 115 and Psychology 115. Faculty would update the outline for Sociology 115 and the administration would copy it and create an updated outline for Psychology 115 so faculty would not have to do both.

Gustin asked what the best way to proceed would be. Parker interjected that the District will need a process for reporting GE transfer patterns. Manzoni asked if Southwestern had a large number of cross listed courses. Hess answered there were several.

Ingle asked Gustin what was behind the Academic Senate’s pressure so the Council could understand the logic. Gustin answered that there is a very old paper that states that the colleges should be assigning courses into multiple disciplines if applicable and it is the responsibility of the curriculum committees to make the decision. The real driving force behind it is to give faculty members more course options to teach. Armstrong stated there are a few faculty members at Mesa College whom are very involved in the State Academic Senate and believe very strongly in cross listing courses, and this has caught on with the Academic Senate.
VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS

A. The October 25, 2007, meeting will be held from 2:00 p.m.–4:00 p.m. at Mesa College in rooms H-117/H-118.
B. Proposals for the November 8, 2007, CIC meeting will be due to Instructional Services by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, October 19, 2007.
C. Handouts:
   1. October 11, 2007, CIC Meeting Agenda
   2. Draft Minutes from the September 13, 2007, CIC meeting
   3. Curriculum Summary
   4. Curriculum Updating Project
   5. CIC Action Lists
   6. 5300.2 Policy & Procedure, Section 7.1

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Hess adjourned the meeting at 3:08 p.m.